

Applicant : Shunpei Yamazaki et al.
Serial No. : 10/022,262
Filed : December 20, 2001
Page : 6 of 6

Attorney's Docket No.: 12/32-CB6001 / US5370

REMARKS

Claims 1-66, 77 and 78 are pending, with claims 1, 7, 13, 21, 29, 37 and 52 being independent. Claims 21-66, 77 and 78 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-3, 7-9, 13-15, 17 and 18 have been amended.

Claims 1, 5-7, 11-13, 19 and 20 have been rejected as being anticipated by Kimura. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Kimura does not describe or suggest a source signal line or a power supply line that includes a conductor and a plated film on upper and side surfaces of the conductor, as recited in each of the independent claims. Rather, Kimura describes a laminate layer including a metallic layer (Cr) and a transparent conductive layer (ITO).

Claims 1-20 have been rejected as being obvious over Shimada in view of Bestel. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because, like Kimura, neither Shimada, Bestel, nor any combination of the two, describes or suggests plating wiring such as a source signal line or power supply line in a light emitting device. The Bestel describes plating, it does not do so in the context of the recited wiring. Accordingly, the combination of Shimada and Bestel cannot disclose a light emitting device in which a source signal line or a power supply line is plated.

In addition, neither Shimada, Bestel, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests a "light emitting element comprising a light emitting layer containing an organic compound," as recited in each of the independent claims. Accordingly, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection for this additional reason.

FAX RECEIVED

JUN 30 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800